

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/030,605	FIEDLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew C Lee	1631	

All Participants:

Status of Application: pending

(1) Matthew C Lee.

(3) _____.

(2) Richard Jenkins.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 January 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Applicant was informed that the previous office action had erroneously treated this application as a regular U.S. application instead of a PCT 371 application. However, upon further examination, it was determined that the restriction requirement under unity of invention rules are the same as set forth in the previous office action. Applicant agreed to the lack of unity restriction requirement and elected the same group and species as set forth in applicant's previous response to restriction requirement filed on 11/22/2004. .